



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/634,701

08/05/2003

Douglas A. Wood

RSW920030050US1

7561

43168 7590 03/26/2008
MARCIA L. DOUBET LAW FIRM
PO BOX 422859
KISSIMMEE, FL 34742

EXAMINER

RADTKE, MARK A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2165

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/26/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mld@mindspring.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/634,701	Applicant(s) WOOD, DOUGLAS A.	
	Examiner MARK A. X RADTKE	Art Unit 2165	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 December 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. In response to communications filed on 18 December 2007, claim(s) 5-7, 9 and 15-17 is/are amended per Applicant's request. Therefore, claims 1-17 are presently pending in the application, of which, claim(s) 1 and 15-17 is/are presented in independent form.
2. In light of Applicant's amendments, the objections to claims 7-10 are withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-6 and 8-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by RDF Syntax ("Resource Description Framework (RDF) Model and Syntax Specification" by W3C, 8 October 1998. Available online at <http://citeseer.ist.psu.edu/article/lassila98resource.html>).

As to claim 1, RDF Syntax teaches a method of uniquely identifying resources (see section 1, "Introduction"), comprising steps of:

modeling the resources using a hierarchical schema, wherein classes in the schema correspond to resource types (see section 1, paragraph 5, line 4, "Classes are organized in a hierarchy") and wherein instances in the schema represent individual resources, each instance being associated with one of the classes according to the resource type of the individual resource represented by the instance (see section 2.1, paragraph 1, last sentence, "resources correspond to objects and properties correspond to instance variables"); and

defining, at a topmost class of the hierarchical schema, a naming rule property and an instance identity property (see section 2.2., paragraph 2, "XML rules"), wherein:

each class at levels of the hierarchical schema beneath the topmost level inherits the naming rule property and the instance identity property (see section 1, paragraph 5);

a value of the naming rule property for a selected class identifies properties of the selected class that enable instances of the selected class to have unique identities (see section 2.1.1, below figure 2); and

an instance of the selected class specifies the unique identity for that instance, using the identified properties for the selected class (see section 1, paragraph 5).

As to claim 2, RDF Syntax teaches further comprising the steps of:

creating an identity for a particular one of the resources, using the naming rule for the class with which a particular instance that represents the particular resource is associated; and

storing the created identity as the value of the instance identity property for the particular instance (see section 2.2, Basic RDF Syntax).

As to claim 3, RDF Syntax teaches further comprising the step of locating a particular instance that represents a particular resource using the value of the instance's identity property (see section 6, Formal Grammar for RDF).

As to claim 4, RDF Syntax teaches wherein the value of the instance identity property for a selected one of the instances comprises a local identity (see section 6, number 1, "p is the expansion of the namespace-qualified tag name...").

As to claim 5, RDF Syntax teaches wherein the value of the instance identity further comprises an identification of a scoping context that is required to provide uniqueness of the instance identity value (see section 2.2.1).

As to claim 6, RDF Syntax teaches wherein the local identity comprises a class name for the class with which the instance is associated and one or more name/value pairs, wherein each name/value pair comprises a property name and a value for that

property name, using property names specified as the value of the naming rule property for the class (see section 6, number 1).

As to claim 9, RDF Syntax teaches wherein the value of the instance identity further comprises an identification of a root scope within which the particular resource is unique (see section 2.2.1, page 2, "namespace").

As to claim 10, RDF Syntax teaches wherein the identification of the root scope comprises a domain name within which the particular resource is located (see section 2.2.1, page 2, where "domain name" is read on "description.org").

As to claim 11, RDF Syntax teaches wherein the value of the naming rule property is specified using a structured document (See section 2.2. XML is a structured document format).

As to claim 12, RDF Syntax teaches wherein the value of the naming rule property is specified using a structured markup language (See section 2.2. XML is a structured markup language).

As to claim 13, RDF Syntax teaches wherein the hierarchical schema is an object-oriented schema (see section 1, paragraph 5).

As to claim 14, RDF Syntax teaches further comprising the step of creating an identity for a particular one of the resources, using the naming rule for the class with which a particular instance that represents the particular resource is associated (see section 2.1, "Resources").

As to claim 15, RDF Syntax teaches a system for uniquely identifying resources (see section 1), comprising:

means for overriding the value of the naming rule property at any of the levels of the hierarchical schema beneath the topmost level (see section 7.3 and see section 3).

For the remaining steps of this claim applicant(s) is/are directed to the remarks and discussions made in claim 1 above.

As to claim 16, RDF Syntax teaches a computer program product for uniquely identifying resources (see section 1), the computer program product embodied on one or more computer-readable media and comprising:

For the remaining steps of this claim applicant(s) is/are directed to the remarks and discussions made in claim 15 above.

As to claim 17, RDF Syntax teaches a method of generating unique resource identities (see section 1), comprising steps of:

For the remaining steps of this claim applicant(s) is/are directed to the remarks and discussions made in claim 1 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over RDF Syntax as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of RDF Schema ("RDF Vocabulary Description Language 1.0: RDF Schema" by W3C).

As to claim 7, RDF Syntax teaches wherein:

the value of the instance identity further comprises an identification of a scoping context that is required to provide uniqueness of the instance identity value (see Examiner's comments regarding claim 7); and

RDF Syntax does not explicitly teach wherein

the identification of the scoping context comprises a scoping class name that identifies a selected one of the classes, wherein the particular resource is unique within the selected class, along with one or more name/value pairs, wherein each name/value pair comprises a scoping class property name and a value for that scoping class property name, wherein the scoping class property names are specified as the value of the naming rule property for the scoping class.

RDF Schema teaches wherein

the identification of the scoping context comprises a scoping class name that identifies a selected one of the classes, wherein the particular resource is unique within the selected class, along with one or more name/value pairs, wherein each name/value pair comprises a scoping class property name and a value for that scoping class property name, wherein the scoping class property names are specified as the value of the naming rule property for the scoping class (see page 10, "rdfs:range").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art at the time the invention was made to have modified RDF Syntax by the teaching of RDF Schema because "[RDF Syntax] does not address how the characteristics of properties are expressed; for such information, refer to the RDF Schema specification." The two documents describe the same technology and are intended to complement each other. Each one makes numerous references to the other.

As to claim 8, RDF Syntax, as modified, teaches wherein the scoping class name is identified in the value of the naming rule property for the class with which the instance is associated (see RDF Schema, page 10, "rdfs:range", "The value of an rdfs:range property is always a Class").

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed on 18 December 2007 with respect to the rejected claims in view of the cited references have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive.

In response to Applicant's arguments that RDF Syntax does not teach a "naming rule property" or an "instance identity property", the arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive.

At its most basic level, the purpose of RDF is to describe resources (RDF = "Resource Description Framework"). "Resources are always named by URIs" (see section 2.1, "Resources"). "RDF will have a class system not unlike many object-oriented programming and modeling systems. A collection of classes (typically authored for a specific purpose or domain) is called a schema. Classes are organized in a hierarchy, and offer extensibility through subclass refinement" (see section 1, paragraph 6). In part, the RDF specification defines how resources are named. As described in section 2.2.1, "[t]he Description element names, in an about attribute, the resource to which each of the statements apply. If the resource does not yet exist [...] then a Description element can create the identifier for the resource using an ID attribute." Thus, the Description element is analogous to the naming rule of the instant claims; it enables instances of a class of resources to have unique names ("A Description element without an about attribute creates a new resource" section 2.2.1). The about

attribute is analogous to the instance identity: "the statements in the Description refer to the resource whose identifier is determined from the about" (see section 2.2.1).

Applicant goes on to argue that the prior art reference fails to teach the inheritance of these properties. In section 2.2.2, nested Description elements are described. This is one way that RDF enables resources to contain resources (other ways are discussed in section 3). In one example, a document is described ("http://www.w3.org/Home/Lassila") having a creator that is another resource ("http://www.w3.org/staffId/85740"). This nesting is equivalent to the object-oriented concept of inheritance. Objects comprising other objects have all the characteristics of the parent objects.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2167

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications should be directed to the examiner, Mark A. Radtke. The examiner's telephone number is (571) 272-7163, and the examiner can normally be reached between 9 AM and 5 PM, Monday through Friday.

If attempts to contact the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin, can be reached at (571) 272-4146.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to Customer Service at (800) 786-9199.

maxr

24 March 2008

/John R. Cottingham/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2167